

Atty. Dkt. No. 10011675-1

REMARKS

This reply is in response to the Office Action mailed on June 22, 2006 in which Claims 1-39 were rejected. With this response, claims 15, 16 and 23-26 are canceled; claims 1 and 21 are amended; and claims 40-43 are added. Claims 1-14, 17-22 and 27-43 are presented for reconsideration and allowance.

I. Claim Objections

Page 2 of the Office Action objected to claim 21 noting that "the handling system" lacks antecedent basis. Claim 21 is amended to add -- media -- before "handling system", wherein "media handling system has antecedent basis in claim 19 from which claim 21 depends. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the objection be withdrawn.

II. Rejection of Claims 23-26 under 35 USC 102(b) Based upon Hirabayashi

Page 2 of the Office Action rejected claims 23-26 under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by Hirabayashi et al. US Patent 6,203,138. Claims 23-26 are canceled, rendering the rejection moot.

III. Rejection of Claims 1-4, 7-10, 12-14 and 18-22 under 35 USC 103(a) Based upon Anderson and Hirabayashi

Page 3 of the Office Action rejected claims 1-4, 7-10, 12-14 and 18-22 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Anderson et al. US Patent 6,176,563 in view of Hirabayashi et al. US Patent 6,203,138. Claims 1-4, 7-10, 12-14 and 18-22, as amended, overcome the rejection based on Anderson and Hirabayashi.

Claim 1 is amended to incorporate the limitations of dependent claimed 16 and intervening claim 15. Claim 1, as amended, recites a printing system having a condenser configured to condense vapor into a condensate and a receptacle configured to collect the condensate. The receptacle is removably coupled to a remainder of the system. The receptacle additionally includes an inlet through which

Atty. Dkt. No. 10011675-1

the condensate flows into the receptacle and a closing portion movable between an inlet open position and an inlet closing position.

Neither Anderson, Hirabayashi nor the prior art of record, including Kim, alone or in combination, disclose or suggest a printing system having a condenser and a removable receptacle receiving condensate from the condenser. As acknowledged by the Office Action, Anderson does not disclose a receptacle that receives condensate from the condenser and that is removable. Kim U. S. Patent 6,101,356, which is relied upon for the rejection of claims 15 and 16, also fails to disclose a removable condensate receiving receptacle.

In rejecting claims former claims 15 and 16, the Office Action attempted to rely upon Hirabayashi by asserting that Hirabayashi discloses a receptacle that is removably coupled to a remainder of the system. However, the receptacle of Hirabayashi is NOT a condensate receiving receptacle. In contrast, the receptacle disclosed by Hirabayashi is for a completely different purpose: receiving waste ink resulting from the cleaning of the recording head 7 (see column 5, lines 35-44 of Hirabayashi). Neither Anderson nor Hirabayashi provide any motivation or suggestion for replacing reservoir 112 or pan 124 with the waste ink receptacle of Hirabayashi. The Office Action also fails to cite any motivation provided by Anderson or Hirabayashi for such a modification. In contrast, the only such motivation would appear to be from Applicants' own disclosure.

Moreover, even assuming, arguendo, that would somehow be obvious to combine the teachings of Anderson and Hirabayashi, the resulting hypothetical combination would still fail to result in a printing system having a removable condensate receiving receptacle. In contrast, the resulting hypothetical combination would come at best, constitute the ink marking device of Anderson additionally including the waste ink disposal number 16 of Hirabayashi receiving waste ink resulting from the cleaning of printhead 104 of Anderson. Accordingly, claim 1, as amended, overcomes the rejection based on Anderson and Hirabayashi. Claims 2-4, 7-10, 12-14 and 18-22 depend from claim 1 and overcome the rejection for the same reasons.

Atty. Dkt. No. 10011675-1

III. Rejection of Claim 5 under 35 USC 103(a) Based upon Anderson, Hirabayashi and Hoffman

Page 6 of the Office Action rejected claim 5 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Anderson et al. US Patent 6,176,563 in view of Hirabayashi et al. US Patent 6,203,138 and further in view of Hoffman et al. US Patent 6,771,916. Claim 5 depends from claim 1 and overcomes rejection for the same reasons discussed above with respect to claim 1. Hoffman fails to satisfy the deficiencies of Anderson and Hirabayashi.

IV. Rejection of Claim 6 under 35 USC 103(a) Based upon Anderson, Hirabayashi and Garcia

Page 7 of the Office Action rejected claim 6 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Anderson et al. US Patent 6,176,563 in view of Hirabayashi et al. US Patent 6,203,138 and further in view of Garcia et al. US Patent 6,076,913. Claim 6 depends from claim 1 and overcomes the rejection for the same reasons discussed above with respect to claim 1. Garcia fails to satisfy the deficiencies of Anderson and Hirabayashi.

V. Rejection of Claim 11 under 35 USC 103(a) Based upon Anderson, Hirabayashi and Sakai

Page 7 of the Office Action rejected claim 11 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Anderson et al. US Patent 6,176,563 in view of Hirabayashi et al. US Patent 6,203,138 and further in view of Sakai US Patent 6,512,900. Claim 11 depends from claim 1 and overcomes the rejection for the same reasons discussed above with respect to claim 1. Sakai fails to satisfy the deficiencies of Anderson and Hirabayashi.

VI. Rejection of Claims 15 and 16 under 35 USC 103(a) Based upon Anderson, Hirabayashi and Kim

Atty. Dkt. No. 10011675-1

Page 8 of the Office Action rejected claims 15 and 16 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Anderson et al. US Patent 6,176,563 in view of Hirabayashi et al. US Patent 6,203,138 and further in view of Kim et al. US Patent 6,101,356. Claims 15 and 16 are canceled with their limitations incorporated into claim 1, rendering this rejection moot. As noted above with respect to claim 1, neither Anderson, Hirabayashi nor Kim disclose a removable condensate receiving receptacle.

VII. Rejection of Claim 17 under 35 USC 103(a) Based upon Anderson, Hirabayashi and Igval

Page 9 of the Office Action rejected claim 17 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Anderson et al. US Patent 6,176,563 in view of Hirabayashi et al. US Patent 6,203,138 and further in view of Igval US Patent 6,357,854. Claim 17 depends from claim 1 and overcomes the rejection for the same reasons discussed above with respect to claim 1. Igval fails to satisfy the deficiencies of Anderson and Hirabayashi.

VIII. Rejection of Claims 27 and 29 under 35 USC 103(a) Based on Anderson and Garcia

Page 10 of the Office Action rejected claims 27 and 29 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Anderson et al. US Patent 6,176,563 in view of Garcia US Patent 6,076,913. Applicants respectfully request that this rejection be withdrawn.

Claim 27 recites a printing system which includes means for condensing vapor to form a condensate and means for storing the condensate, wherein the means for storing includes an inlet and means for automatically occluding the inlet when disconnected from a remainder of the printing system.

Neither Anderson nor Garcia, alone or in combination, disclose means for storing condensate that may be disconnected from the remainder of the printing system. As noted above, Anderson does not disclose a removable condensate

Atty. Dkt. No. 10011675-1

receiving receptacle. Neither reservoir 112 nor pan 124 are disclosed as being removable. Page 8 of the Office Action specifically acknowledges that Anderson does not disclose the receptacle that is removably coupled to a remainder of the system.

Garcia also fails to disclose means for storing condensate which may be disconnected from the remainder of the printing system. In fact, the Office action fails to even allege that Garcia discloses means for storing condensate that may be disconnected from a remainder of the printing system. Thus, the Office action has failed to establish even a *prima facie* case of obviousness with regard to claim 27.

Moreover, neither Anderson nor Garcia, alone or in combination, disclose a condensate receiving receptacle having means for automatically occluding an inlet of the storing means when the storing means is disconnected from the remainder of the printing system. Page 10 of the Office Action acknowledges that Anderson does not disclose means for automatically occluding the inlet. As a result, the Office Action attempt to add to rely upon Garcia. However, Garcia does not disclose a condensate receiving receptacle having means for automatically occluding an inlet of the condensate receiving receptacle. In contrast, Garcia merely discloses a valve arrangement on an inkjet cartridge. Neither Anderson nor Garcia discloses any motivation or suggestion for adding a valve arrangement to reservoir 112 or pan 124. In fact, since neither reservoir 112 nor pan 124 is even removable or disconnectable, there would be no reason to add means for automatically occluding upon disconnection of the storing means. Rather, the only motivation would appear to be from Applicants' own disclosure.

Furthermore, even assuming, arguendo, that it would be obvious to combine the teachings of Anderson and Garcia, the resulting hypothetical combination would still fail to disclose a removable storing means having means for automatically occluding an inlet of the storing means when the storing means is disconnected from the remainder of the printing system. In contrast, at most, the hypothetical combination would consist of the ink marking device of Anderson additionally including one or more ink jet cartridges having the valve of Garcia. Thus, the

Atty. Dkt. No. 10011675-1

rejection of claim 27 should be withdrawn. Claim 29 depends from claim 27 and is patently distinct over the prior art of record for the same reasons.

IX. Rejection of Claims 27 and 29 under 35 USC 103(a) Based on Anderson and Garcia

Page 11 of the Office Action rejected claims 28 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Anderson et al. US Patent 6,176,563 in view of Garcia US Patent 6,076,913 and further in view of Hirabayashi et al. US Patent 6,203,138. Claim 28 depends from claim 27 and overcomes rejection from the same reasons discussed above with respect to claim 27. Hirabayashi fails to satisfy the deficiencies of Anderson and Garcia.

X. Rejection of Claims 30, 33-36 and 39 under 35 USC 103(a) Based on Brinkly and Hirabayashi

Page 11 of the Office Action rejected claims 30, 33-36 and 39 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brinkly U. S. Patent 6,397,488 in view of Hirabayashi et al. US Patent 6,203,138. For the reasons which follow, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection be withdrawn.

Claim 30 recites a method of printing ink upon a medium. The method includes condensing vapor into a condensate, collecting the condensate in a receptacle and absorbing at least a portion of the condensate in an absorption member within the receptacle.

Neither Brinkly nor Hirabayashi, alone or in combination, disclose or suggest absorbing condensate in an absorption member within a receptacle. Page 12 of the Office Action expressly acknowledges that Brinkly does not disclose absorbing condensate in an absorption member within a receptacle. As a result, the Office Action attempts to additionally rely upon Hirabayashi by asserting that Hirabayashi discloses absorbing condensate into an absorption member within a receptacle.

Atty. Dkt. No. 10011675-1

However, this characterization of Hirabayashi is incorrect. Hirabayashi does not disclose absorbing condensate in an absorption member within a receptacle. Hirabayashi does not disclose a condensate receiving receptacle. In contrast, the receptacle disclosed by Hirabayashi is for a completely different purpose: receiving waste ink resulting from the cleaning of the recording head 7 (see column 5, lines 35-44 of Hirabayashi). Neither Brinkly nor Hirabayashi provide any motivation or suggestion for replacing vessel 116 with the waste ink receptacle of Hirabayashi. The Office Action also fails to cite any motivation provided by Brinkly or Hirabayashi for such a modification. In contrast, the only such motivation would appear to be from Applicants own disclosure.

Moreover, even assuming, arguendo, that would somehow be obvious to combine the teachings of Brinkly and Hirabayashi, the resulting hypothetical combination would still fail to result in a printing system having a condensate receiving receptacle with an absorption member for absorbing condensate. In contrast, the resulting hypothetical combination would, at best, constitute the printing device of Brinkly additionally including the waste ink disposal number 16 of Hirabayashi receiving waste ink resulting from the cleaning of print engine 22 of Brinkly. Accordingly, claim 30, as amended, overcomes the rejection based on Brinkly and Hirabayashi. Claims 33-36 and 39 depend from claim 30 and overcome the rejection for the same reasons.

XI. Rejection of Claims 31, 32 and 38 under 35 USC 103(a) Based on Brinkly, Hirabayashi and Anderson

Page 13 of the Office Action rejected claims 31, 32 and 38 under 35 USC 103(a) as being compatible over Brinkly U. S. Patent 6,397,488 in view of Hirabayashi et al. US Patent 6,203,138 and a further in view of Anderson US Patent 6,176,563. Claims 31, 32 and 38 depends from claim 30 and overcome the rejection for the same reasons discussed above with respect to claim 30. Anderson fails to satisfy the deficiencies of Brinkly and Hirabayashi.

Atty. Dkt. No. 10011675-1

XII. Rejection of Claim 37 under 35 USC 103(a) Based on Brinkly, Hirabayashi and Igval

Page 14 of the Office Action rejected claims 37 under 35 USC 103(a) as being compatible over Brinkly U. S. Patent 6,397,488 in view of Hirabayashi et al. US Patent 6,203,138 and a further in view of Igval US Patent 6,357,854. Claim 37 depends from claim 30 and overcomes the rejection for the same reasons discussed above with respect to claim 30. Igval fails to satisfy the deficiencies of Brinkly and Hirabayashi.

XIII. Added Claims

With this response, claims 40-43 are added. Claims 40-43 are believed to be patentably distinct over the prior art of record.

A. Claim 40

Claim 40 depends from claim 9 and further recites a plurality of fins thermally coupled to the thermoelectric module. Support for added claim 40 may be found in at least Figures 3 and 4. Thus, no new matter is believed to be added.

The prior art of record fails to disclose a thermoelectric module thermally coupled to fins for condensing vapor in a printing system. Thus, claim 40 is presented for consideration and allowance.

B. Claims 41 and 42

Claim 41 depends from claim 40. Claim 42 depends from claim 1. Claims 41 and 42 each recite that the condenser includes fins converging from an inlet side proximate the ink dispenser and having a first dimension to an outlet site distant the ink dispenser and having a second smaller dimension. Support for added claims 41 and 42 may be found in at least Figures 3 and 4. Thus, no new matter is believed to be added.

Atty. Dkt. No. 10011675-1

The prior art of record fails to disclose a condenser having fins that converge from an inlet side proximate Inc. dispenser and having a first dimension to an outlet side distant think dispenser and having a second smaller dimension. Thus, claims 41 and 42 are presented for consideration and allowance.

C. Claim 43

Claim 43 depends from claim 1 and recites that the printing system further includes one or more conduits configured to direct all of the condensate from the condenser to the receptacle. The prior art of record fails to disclose the printing system of claim one additionally including the recited conduits. Accordingly, claim 43 is presented for consideration and allowance.

XIV. Conclusion

Applicants believe that the present application is now in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration of the application as amended is respectfully requested.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is felt that a telephone interview would advance the prosecution of the present application.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required regarding this application under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16-1.17, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 08-2025. Should no proper payment be enclosed herewith, as by a check being in the wrong amount, unsigned, post-dated, otherwise improper or informal or even entirely missing, the Commissioner is authorized to charge the unpaid amount to Deposit Account No. 08-2025. If any extensions of time are needed for timely acceptance of papers submitted herewith, Applicant hereby petitions for such extension under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 and authorizes payment of any such extensions fees to Deposit Account No. 08-2025.

Atty. Dkt. No. 10011675-1

Respectfully submitted,

Date Sept. 20, 2006

By Todd A. Rathe

RATHE PATENT & IP LAW
Customer No. 22879
Telephone: (262) 478-9353
Facsimile: (262) 238-1469

Todd A. Rathe
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 38,276